Title : T.S.Eliot and Ferdinand de Saussure:
An Intertextual Reading

Abstract :

T.S.Eliot and Ferdinand de Sasussure are major voice in the formation of the twentieth - century critical epistemology .Their contributions towards the development of criticism and language respectively are substantial . This study attempts an intertextual reading of their contributions and demonstrates the need to integrate the various disciplines of knowledge in the field of humanities.

T.S.Eliot and Ferdinand de Saussure:
An Intertextual Reading

Focal Points:

The first few decades of the twentieth century witnessed an intellectual revolution across the various disciplines of knowledge. It was so fertile a ground that many bodies of thought and constituencies of knowledge flourished, and nourished different and divergent currents of ideas across the board. Unprecedented and unparalleled marches were made by scientific discourse. Science pervaded every single walk of life, and altered hitherto-established notions. It brought about radically new perceptions of the whole phenomena. Its impact was perfectly discernable as well as desirable. Not only did it permeate its own field, but it also crossed its boundaries to touch the other, the humanities, and to get it flow with its current. Under the spell of the scientific spirit with its disinterested enquiry, the field of the humanities got drastically transformed. Old paradigms incurred radical interrogation, and got replaced by new conceptions and fresh perspectives. In these arenas of human investigation, the impact of science is clearly perceptible. In criticism, for instance, there were dramatic changes: there was the attack on impressionistic acts of reading, and the call for an objectively verifiable and scientific mode of critical inquiry; “intentional fallacy” as well as “affective fallacy,” demythologization and demystification were on the top priorities of the agenda of change; and the intrinsic approach was adopted to the exclusion of the extrinsic, which pays considerable attention to biographical, historical, or contextual data, etc. “When we are considering poetry, we must consider it primarily as poetry and not as other thing” (Eliot viii). Language is no exception to the irresistible hegemony of the scientific discourse. The nineteenth-century historical approach to language was substituted for a linguistic approach, scientifically motivated to examining language as a distinct phenomenon, with no reference to any external information. The earlier philological investigations of language were of little significance; priority was given to the scientific inquiry, which scrutinizes language as a system, structured by elements, and functions in line with certain mechanisms. Linguistics became much of a descriptive nature than a prescriptive one. The focus was directed not so much to the end of any human endeavour as to the process of that effort. The twentieth century captured the the glimpses of the dawn of science, nurtured its conditions of possibility, and documented its invincible

power. Hardly can one find or even think of any branch of knowledge that remained uncontaminated or unenergized by the scientific model. Thereupon, the era stood witness to a cross-fertilization-- a process of interactivity between two disciplines or entities-- between the scientific discourse and the field of humanities. This step has paved the way for a more interdisciplinary participation among the different branches of the human exploratory voyage on earth.

Guided by Roman Jakobson's insight: "A linguist deaf to the poetic function of language, and a literary scholar indifferent to linguistic methods and unconversant with linguistic problems, are equally flagrant anachronisms," the present study attempts to explore Ferdinand de Saussure's linguistic insights and T.S.Eliot's critical notions, and to examine the possibility of drawing parallels between these major authorities in linguistics and criticism respectively. It is an intertextual reading, designed to compare and contrast their ideas, explore the nature of this exercise, and experience the thrill of their encounter. The study is divided into three parts. Part I introduces T.S.Eliot's major critical notions, especially in the context of *The Sacred Wood* (1920). Part II presents the central ideas of Saussurean linguistics as advanced in *A Course in General Linguistics* (1916). The concluding part is devoted to an intertextual reading between their insights.

Part I: T.S.Eliot

T.S.Eliot is a major critical authority in the twentieth century. His critical acts have a strong impact on the critical and literary currents of ideas; they significantly bear the marks of the Anglo-American New Critical School. "A poem," holds Eliot, " has its own life; that its parts from something quite different from a body of neatly ordered biographical data; that the feeling, or emotion or vision, resulting from the poem is something different from the feeling or emotion or vision in the mind of the poet" (x). His critical credo falls on the autonomous nature of the artifact, with which any engagement has to be intrinsically textual. Classicist in literature, he is concerned with the representation of the artifact as an organically-constructed piece; form and content are inseparable. The work of art, in his views, constitutes a unit in a larger whole; it is a product of everything that preceded it as well as of a poetic genius. Moreover, 'tradition, 'individual talent,' 'historical sense,' 'objective correlative,' 'dissociation of sensibility, 'unified sensibility,' etc. are Eliot's major critical notions. They typically portray his intellectual commitment as a character most interested in the health of the institution, the well-being of the individual, and the ethical sanity of the community. They remarkably display how, on the one hand, the individual is a product of the collective and, on the other, a state of equilibrium among the senses (heart and head) is most desirable. This equilibrium among the senses seems to invite a deeper reflection on the ideal state and condition of the

society; beyond all sectarian imperatives, the members of the society need to live in harmony with one another so that their work may fructify. By analogy, the work of art has to be characterized by a profound sense of equilibrium between intellect and emotion. Eliot's notions are worth exploring.

The Sacred Wood commences with Eliot's attack on any critical response fed on sentiments. This emotionally-charged act, he diagnoses the problem, "alters the object, but never transforms it" (6). The illusions of the emotional impact created by the work of art are mere "accidents of personal association" (Eliot 7). Such acts of criticism are sheer expressions of emotions, they represent a "suppressed creative wish." They do not contribute to the moulding of one's character, nor do they help enhance one's intellectual horizon. The sentimentally-informed response to literature is stripped of that kind of analytical rigour, which is the mark of a proper process of literary scrutiny. A critical approach centred on the text has the potential to "reawaken the mind from the lethargy of experience" (in the words of Coleridge). A critical method of this sort provides the reader with a chance to experience the thrill of literature, to change his ways of seeing, and to come back to the world armed with a competent mind and an understanding heart. "The end of the enjoyment of poetry," Eliot writes, "is a pure contemplation from which all the accidents of personal emotion are removed; thus we aim to see the object as it really is" (15). In this modality, criticism is a development of sensibility and sensitivity; it is an opportunity for self-enhancement

"Tradition and the Individual Talent" crystallizes Eliot's prominent concepts of the nature of artistic composition, its conditions of possibility, criterion of originality, and meaning of individuality. It is a critical treatise on art-making process, as a product of the nexus of the past and the present, and how these elements impinge upon each other across the continuum of time. This essay engages with the question of "tradition", and elucidates Eliot's perception of it as an essential component in the structure of any work of art-- "not only the best, but the most individual parts of his work may be those in which the dead poets, his ancestors, assert their immortality most rigorously" (*Sacred Wood* 48). The essay also demonstrates Eliot's notion of "individual talent." Is poetry a pure product of the poet's genius? Is it an expression of his or her peculiar experiences? Is it a mode of self-expression?

Eliot presents his ideas of "tradition" and accentuates its role in the construction of any piece of art. For him, tradition is not a blind and mechanical adherence to the past, nor is it an elegy mourning its vanished glory. Tradition, in Eliot's views, is an essential component of the art-making process. It is the background against which art can rise and enlighten the world. Tradition is a life-breathing force by virtue of which art can see the broad light of the day; it breathes life into all the constitutive elements of art. Tradition is conceived and conceptualized as the backbone of all art; it is essential to the very being of art.

[Tradition] involves, in the first place, the historical sense, which we may call nearly indispensable to anyone who would continue to be a poet beyond his twenty-fifth year; and the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional. And it is at the same time what makes a writer most acutely conscious of his place in time, of his contemporaniety. (*Sacred Wood* 49)

This lengthy quotation advances Eliot's notion of tradition as a historical sense: an awareness of the pastness of the past and the presence of the past. To be traditional is to be conscious of the demarcation between the pastness of the past and its presence. That is, in order for a poet to be designated as traditional, he or she should have a discriminating sense to distinguish between those ruins, relics, and remains of the past which are arid of any further inspiration, have no relevance whatsoever to the present, and are but burden on the shoulders of their caretaker, and those monuments, texts, objects, and articles which are still perennial, bright sources of inspiration, and have the potential to be further explored. Having such a capacity, one becomes crowned with the historical sense as an informing and guiding principle; he or she, as a result, is in a position to select the relevant and to discard the reverse. The process of selecting lucrative pieces of the past and composing them into an order is, in fact, what renders one traditional. Being traditional hinges upon one's effort to de-centre the elements of the past, and re-assemble the useful fragments. Through these individual contributions, one gains access to a certain community with a particular history that usually extends far beyond the life of the individual human being. Thereupon, tradition enables one to connect the present with the past (of course the useful and usable parts of the past), to transcend one's own immediate present (the temporal), to initiate dialogue with the past, to have future-oriented tasks, to constitute the site for the coming together of the temporal and the timeless, to become a mediator or a medium between the past and the future, and to become an active agent, capable of mapping across the different and divergent eras and arenas, connecting and uniting, and ultimate creating a symphony of creative and cognitive fluidity. "It is part of the business of the critic to preserve tradition- where a good tradition exists. It is part of his business to see literature steadily and to see it whole,…to see it beyond time" (*Sacred Wood* xvi).

No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance , his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him; for contrast and comparison, among the dead. (*Sacred Wood* 49)

Eliot sets the poet's critical and conscious commitment to his or her predecessors as a touchstone method for aesthetic significance. Conscious adherence to the past becomes the criterion for poetic excellence. His or her poetic significance hinges upon the degree to which they draw upon the meaningful part of their ancestors' history. The poetic production of individual poets, in isolation from their relevant past, has little meaning on its own; it is so arid an arena that it hardly can stand as it cannot fall back upon a fertile and forceful past. It becomes more meaningful, and acquires force, when it is constructed or read against a certain historical background. Poetry is conceived of as an organic composition; individual parts, delinked from the whole, are meaningless. The healthy existence of each part, and by implication each poet, is predicated upon their participation in the body of the whole. In this syndrome of thought, poetic exuberance is synonymous with meaningful falling back upon tradition. It is the structure of the whole composition that endows meaning to the parts. The continuity of each part, therefore, depends on the continuity of the structure. In other words, the more the poet endeavours to draw upon the resources of tradition, the more versatile his production becomes. The poet's status is assessed by his or her degree of traditionality.

Punctuated by his notions of tradition, Eliot throws further light on the nature of the relationship that has to exist between the past and the present. For him, the present needs to learn from the past, to get directed by the past, and, , most important of all, to get inspirational guidance from the past. The past is seen as the cumulative effect of the whole experiences of the bygone eras; it contains lessons of significance to the present. The present needs to look backward only to move forward. Yet, Eliot maintains that "the past should be altered by the present." Despite being a source of inspiration that can help boost the present, the past is also a breeding ground for a sheer amount of false notions, superstitions, ill-formed habits of thoughts, and customs. It is the duty of the present to expose those ills of the past with the motive of rectifying them. Having succeeded the past, and acquired a much larger scope of experiences, the present has the corrective function of drawing a clear line of demarcation between the worth cultivating customs and ideas, and those which need to be totally discarded. Only in this way can humanity move forward in its pilgrimage on earth. The complementary, interactive approach between the past and the present can help promote and re-circulate relevant, healthy, meaningful notions, capable of furthering the future prosperity of one and all. "The past should be altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past" (*Sacred Wood* 50).

Having elaborated his notion of "tradition," Eliot advances his idea of "the individual talent." Contrary to the romantic conception of poetry as aproduct of the poet's personal "emotions recollected in tranquility," Eliot contends that "poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of

personality, but an escape from personality" (*Sacred Wood* 58). Poetry is presented here not as a medium through which the poet puts across his or her personal feelings and sentiments. It is not a chance for personal relief of emotionally-charged situations and memories, nor is it an occasion for portraying the poet's personal life and glorifying his or her forlorn moments. In Eliot's conception, poetry is a serious tool for self-elevation, intellectual enhancement and ethical commitment. Poetry is conceived here as an opportunity one has to take to experience the thrill of literature, a chance for intellectual exercise in analytic rigour. It is an occasion in which the disparate elements or experiences get amalgamated (*Selected Essays* 287), in which head and heart join hands, and in which "memory and desire" get mixed. Rare moments as these in which Time present and time past Are both perhaps present in time future, And time future contained in time past And Time past and time future
What might have been and what has been Point to one end, which is always present
(Eliot "Burnt Norton," I.)
are the outcome of such poetry as conceived and conceptualized by Eliot, who states: "The intensity of the artistic process, the pressure, so to speak, under which the fusion takes place, that counts" (*Sacred Wood* 55). Poetry is not regarded as "self-expression". Rather, it is "a continual self-sacrifice, a continual self-extinction"; it is an opportunity to transcend one's self, to have a larger trans-subjective perspective, and to have a disinterested eye on humanity. The a disinterested eye on humanity. The poet becomes another human being, profoundly concerned with the welfare of the other. He or she becomes a "catalyst", a medium through which the ordinary human being can voice his or her agony, put across his or her bitter experiences to be shared by fellow-human beings, and feels his or her humanness in a world bereft of humanity. The poet becomes the bridge across which one can hope to reach one's destination. By being a medium, or a "catalyst", or a "vessel" in which experiences get mixed, the poet would be assigned a more sublime duty in the society; he or she becomes an essential social element, the voice of the other. Having such a task, the poet's rank would be elevated and highly appreciated. "The more perfect the artist, the more completely separate in him the man who suffers and the mind which creates; the more perfectly will the mind digest and transmute the passions which are its material" (*Sacred Wood* 54).

Along these lines of thought, Eliot's doctrine of impersonality gets introduced. For him, the heart of the matter is not the history of the poet per se; it is the poem itself which deserves the attention. Any critical examination should focus not on the personal life of the artist, but on the artifact itself. The work of art should constitute the object of all critical scrutiny; "to divert interest from the poet to the poetry is a laudable aim" (*Sacred Wood* 59).
It is an invitation to a close analysis of the text with no regard to any biographical, sociological, or contextual data.

"The words on the page" should be the guiding principle for any critical delineation of art. "The emotion of art," Eliot writes, "is impersonal. And the poet cannot reach this impersonality without surrendering himself wholly to the work to be done" (*Sacred Wood* 59). Therefore, the text becomes the site in which all artistic and critical efforts get actualized. The artist should surrender him-herself only to have an objective element in the construction of the text. The reader, too, should put aside all "accidents of personal association" and focus on the text with its intricacies and subtleties. Eliot's critical approach is essentially text-centred. "Honest criticism and sensitive appreciation is directed not upon the poet but upon the poetry" (*Sacred Wood* 53).

In his essay on *Hamlet,* Eliot denounces the play as an "artistic failure" (*Sacred Wood* 98). He bases this view on his notion of "objective correlative." This notion, as he defines it, is "a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion" (100). It refers to the fact of expressing feelings and ideas through situations and images. Emotions and thoughts, in Eliot' perception, need to be objectified by presenting them in appropriate images or situations. Good art objectifies feeling, expressing it through the description of things. Good art is equally concerned with thought. In Hamlet, his excessive emotional state is too much for his situation that such an emotion is inexpressible (*Sacred Wood* 101). In the personage of Hamlet, "it is the buffoonery of an emotion which can find no outlet in action" (Eliot 102). Eliot contends that for any work of art achieve success, it is necessary to have an "objective correlative" as a device by virtue of which the external elements (emotions and ideas) get interiorized into the very texture of the work. These elements get redeemed of any subjective colouring, and attain a state of objectivity as "the condition of science" (53).

"Dissociation of sensibility" is yet another major notion advanced by Eliot. It is a dearth of a match between thought and feeling; it is a lack of "a direct sensuous apprehension of thought or recreation of feeling into thought" (*Selected Essays* 286).The absence of this sense of equilibrium or match between thought and feeling is a syndrome of "dissociation of sensibility." Eliot holds that Tennyson and browning "are poets, and they think but they do not feel their thought as immediately as the odour of a rose," whereas "a thought to Donne was an experience; it modifies his sensibility" (*Selected Essays* 287). In the mind of the poet "perfectly equipped for its work," disparate "experiences are always forming new wholes." Here unity of being, where intellect and emotion are matched, is imagined as participating in a grand temporal narrative. As opposed to the "dissociated sensibility" stands "unified sensibility". In the latter sensibility, Eliot maintains that there are three conditions to be fulfilled by any artist to have a "unified sensibility". There conditions are: accuracy of sense perception, dramatic situation, and immediacy of presentation. To cite an example in this respect, one can refer to the first line f John Donne's "The Sun Rising": "Busy old fool, unruly Sun" to see how the dramatic situation is

captured by the use of the apostrophe, the balance between heart and head, and the immediate situation. It is not an “emotion recollected in tranquility”; it is a poetry characterized by a feeling thought, a poetry of action, and precise imagery.

[Eliot’s] influence on the taste of his time is most conspicuous: he has done more than anybody else to promote the shift of sensibility away from the taste of the "Georgians" and to revaluate the major periods and figures of the history of English poetry. He reacted most strongly against romanticism, he criticized Milton and the Miltonic tradition, he exalted Dante, and Jacobean dramatists, the metaphysical poets, Dryden, and the French symbolists as "the tradition" of great poetry. But Eliot is at least equally important for his theory of poetry, which buttresses this new tasteand which is much more coherent and systematic than most commentators and Eliot himself have allowed. His concept of "impersonal poetry," his description of the creative process, which demands a "unified sensibility," and should end in an "objective correlative," his justification of "tradition," his scheme of the history of English poetry as a process which led to the "dissociation" of an originally unified sensibility, his emphasis on the "perfection of common speech" as the language of poetry, his discussion of the relationship between ideas and poetry under the term "belief"- all these are crucial critical matters for which Eliot found memorable formulas, if not always convincing solutions. (Menand 577)

Part II: Ferdinand de Saussure

The rise of Saussure’s linguistic theory after his posthumously-published *Course in General Linguistics* (1916) has a powerful impact on the radical moves made in twentieth-century linguistics. He attempts to theorize drastic departures from earlier views and contributes significantly to semiology. In an objectively, scientific and systematic theorization, he departs from the hitherto-established historical approach of the nineteenth-century linguistics and philosophical generalizations. Saussure’s ideas are of prime significance in establishing the theoretical foundations of modern descriptive linguistics. He approaches the phenomenon of language from a categorically scientific trajectory. Uncontaminated by any other perspective, language is scientifically delineated as a sub-system (from the total system of society), with its own mechanism and autonomous entity. He views language as a composite of certain elements. These components of language have their own share in the functioning of this system; each has a set role to play according to the general scheme of the whole system. Language is thus theorized as a self-sufficient system, divorced from any other external contact. In the words of Saussure, “language is a system whose parts can and must all be considered in their synchronic solidarity” (87).

In Saussurean linguistic theory, language is designated as a system, composed of linguistic signs. A linguistic sign is a double-headed psychological entity (Saussure 66). The two heads of this sign are the signifier and the signified. While the signifier refers to

a graphic or acoustic image, the signified refers to a concept image (meaning). There two parts are essentially intertwined. In the words of Saussure: “Language can also be compared with a sheet of paper: thought is the front and the sound the back; one cannot cut the front without cutting the back at the same time; likewise in language, one can neither divide sound from thought nor thought from sound” (113).

The bond between the signifier and the signified is totally “arbitrary” on account of the fact that the meaning of a word is not inherent in the sound comprising that word, but depends on the conventional use of the word by the community. There is no logical or natural connection between a sign and what it signifies. Rather, what links them is the conventions of a particular speech community (Saussure 14). In other words, language is a system of rules accepted by a speech community. “Language,” maintains Saussure, “never exists apart from the social fact, for it is a semiological phenomenon. Its social nature is one of its inner characteristics” (77). Meaning is conventional; it is not something inherent in either the signifier or the signified. Meaning depends upon a cultural convention and not upon some fixed point outside language or culture. “Meaning is socially constructed, and the social construction of the signifying system is intimately related, therefore, to the social formation itself” (Belsey 39).

Saussure contends that linguistic elements are defined in relationships of combination and contrast with one another. First, in terms of the combinatorial relations, he continues to say that any linguistic act is a product of the processes of choice and chain. The process of choice occurs along the paradigmatic axis (the “axis of succession” or the vertical axis), which contains all the linguistic signs. It is the axis of selection; linguistic signs get selected from this plane. The second process is that of chain, in which the selected linguistic signs get arranged and structured according to certain patterning mechanisms. The process of chain takes place on the syntagmatic axis (the “axis of simultaneities” or the horizontal axis). Therefore, a linguistic sign is a combination of certain elements selected out of the whole bank of language available along the vertical axis, and arranged and clustered on the horizontal axis.

Secondly, in terms of the contrastive relations, Saussure maintains that a linguistic sign is defined in terms of what it is not. That is to say, it is difference which gives a particular linguistic sign its meaning. Meaning is a differential process; the linguistic sign has meaning because of its difference from other linguistic signs in the system. Meaning is assumed to be created by difference, not by "presence," (that is, identity with the object of meaning). Signs do not directly represent the reality to which they refer, but, following Saussurean linguistics, mean by difference from other words in a concept set. All meaning is only meaning in reference to, and in distinction from, other meanings; there is no meaning in any stable or absolute sense. . “The most revolutionary element in Saussure’s position,” contends Belsey, “was his insistence that language is not a nomenclature, a way of naming things

which already exist, but a system of differences with no positive terms" (36).

In Saussurean linguistics, language occurs at two levels: "langue" and "parole". The former refers to a set of rules and language laws, which governs the whole process of language. It is the abstract part of language, which lays down the grammar of language, and its "principles of regularity" (93). "Langue" is the underlying structure that underpins the system of language. "Parole", on the other hand, is composed of the concrete utterances of members of a language community. It is language in actual speech situations. Language is, therefore, a product of the rules as codified by the langue, and manifested in actual speech by parole. The langue-parole relationship may be taken to represent the theory - practice relationship. Yet, it should always be considered in view that in Saussurean linguistic theory, langue counts much more than parole. Saussure is concerned with the rules that govern all languages.

One of the major premises of Saussure is his idea that language has two essential dimensions: diachronic and synchronic. According to the diachronic dimension of language, language changes over a period of time. Language mutability marks the changes that take place in language as it travels across time. The synchronic dimension of language, on the other hand, states that language does not change at any point of time. Language is immune to change; it remains static at any point of time. While the diachronic dimension is historically-oriented, the synchronic counterpart is descriptive. "Synchronic study," explains Robey, " considers how a language functions as a system at a given moment in time, analyzing the simultaneous relationships between its constituent parts; it examines how a language works, not how it develops" (49). As it seems clear, Saussurean linguistic theory is synchronic in orientation; it tends to examine language at a certain point with no reference to the changes that may accompany it as it travels across time. Scientific in approach, synchronic in orientation, Saussurean linguistics conceives of language as a changeless structure, composed of fixed components, having particular properties and functions, and delinked from any other foreign to its structural and semiotic nature.

Part III: T.S.Eliot and Ferdinand de Saussure

The following is an intertextual attempt made between Eliot's crucial insights with those of Saussure. For the sake of clarity, the different threads of the argument are clustered in the form of points.

1- both Eliot and Saussure, literature and language respectively are regarded as systems, dehistoricised, decontextualized and divorced from the social sphere. They are thought of as self-referential, self-sufficient autonomous entities. Literature and language, in this way, are deprived of a great deal of activity and interactivity with other disciples.

2- pite having theorized literature and language as isolated systems, Eliot and Saussure do not deny the fact that meaning is essentially social. Eliot's "tradition" and Saussure's arbitrariness of the linguistic sign stand testimony to the fact that meaning is not the product of the individual talent nor is it inherent in the sign itself. Rather, meaning arises out of the collective community, from the social domain. It is a collective decision.

3- alistic mode of thinking is pervasive in both Eliot and Saussure. Notions are arranged in binary oppositions; they are clustered in bi-polar systems. In Eliot, there are tradition and individual talent, feeling and thought, presence of the past and pastness of the past (historical sense), situations and images (objective correlative), etc. Saussurean bi-planner linguistic theory is founded on the same principle: signified and signifier (linguistic sign), langue and parole, paradigmatic axis and syntagmatic axis, diachronic dimension and the synchronic one.

4- While Eliot's tradition perhaps corresponds to Saussure's langue, individual talent corresponds to parole. Tradition as the background upon which one can depend and draw is perceived as equivalent to langue as the rules, which legitimate and otherwise, certain uses of language. Conceived as wholes, they both occupy essential spaces in the background of the individual talent or the parole respectively. The latter notions are manifestations of the idiosyncrasies of the part; they both represent the peculiar and singular experiences or utterances of individuals.

5- The diachronic dimension of language as stated by Saussure seems to run parallel to Eliot's "pastness of the past", while the synchronic dimension is perhaps a parallel to "the presence of the past." In the early two notions, change occurs, whereas in the latter two, there is no perceptible change.

6- Eliot accentuates the notion of "objective correlative" for the success of any work of art. On the paradigmatic axis, there exist all feelings and thoughts. Their counterparts (situations and images) exist on the syntagmatic axis. The shift from the paradigmatic axis to the syntagmatic axis is facilitated and brought about by the objective correlative. Like the artist, this notion becomes the medium and "catalyst" for any artistic process. Similarly, in Saussurean linguistic theory, the selection of the signs occur on the vertical axis, and their arrangement into meaningful units takes place on the horizontal axis.

7- Both of them participate in the invitation to move towards scientific, objective research. Personal, communal, or historical associations are relegated to the margins. Research has to be conducted in a spirit of disinterested enquiry.

8- For both f them, the heart of the matter is the centre of the continuum. That is, for Eliot neither the author nor the reader counts. What counts most is the text. Likewise, Saussure focuses on language per se. . The producers as well as the receivers of linguistic signs have little significance in Saussurean linguistic

theory. The linguistic sign is the bone of all contention. “Without language,” states Saussure, “thought is a vague, uncharted nebula. There are no pre-existing ideas, and nothing is distinct before the appearance of language” (112).

9- Form seems to constitute yet another aspect of similarity between Eliot and Saussure. Form, in Eliot’s context, is essential; he is considered a New Critic to whom form is the “achieved content” and one of their major tenets. For Saussure, “linguistics works in the borderland where the elements of sound and thought combine; their combination produces a form, not a substance” (113).

To conclude, it seems clear that there always exists the possibility of finding a space in a world crowded with voices and noises. Within these luminal spaces, one can still hope to administer, conduct, organize, experiment and bring about whole new projects. The present study, I must admit, is not claimed to be an entirely novel project, capable of intellectual challenge or epistemic violence. Rather, it is only an attempt meant to throw light on the possibility of further thinking about the available materials, the possibility of further critical engagement with what one has. Guided by Eliot’s insight of tradition, one feels tempted to affirm that in order for one to move forward, one must always look backward. This backward look is not an end in itself, but is rather a process, a source of inspiration that can keep the “wheel of fire” on. Unless we look backward to draw guidance, to get informed, and, most important of all, to learn from the experiences of others, we, by all means, join hands with Nietzsche that the only thing that we learnt from history is that we learnt nothing.

العنوان : تي أس اليوت و فرناند دي ساسيور
دراسة تناصية

يعتبر تي أس اليوت و فرناند دي ساسيور من عمالقة القرن العشرين الذين أسهمو في تكوين علم المعرفة النقدي الحديث ۰ فقد أسهما بشكل كبير في تطوير مفاهيم النقد والادب على حد السواء ۰ الدراسة الحالية تهدف الى اقامة علاقة تناص بين مساهمات اليوت وساسيور وتوضح مدى أهمية دمج حقول المعرفة في الدراسات الانسانية المعاصرة ۰

References

Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.

Eliot, T.S. *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen,1920.

---. *Selected Essays*. 1932. London: Faber, 1969.

Jefferson, Ann and David Robey. *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction.* New Jersey, Barnes, 1986.

Menand, Louis. “T.S.Eliot and Modernity.” *The New England Quarterly*. 69, No.4 Dec. 1996: 554-579. Jstor. 7 May 2008. http://www.jstor.org/stable/366554.

Molina, David Newton-de, ed. *The Literary Criticism of T.S.Eliot: New Essays*. London: Anthlone, 1977.

Onega, Susana. “Structuralism and Narrative Poetics.” *Literary Theory and Criticism: An Oxford Guide*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. New York: OUP, 2006. 259-279.

Pritchard, John Paul. *Criticism in America: An Account of the Development of Critical Techniques From the Early Period of the Republic to the Middle Years of the Twentieth Century*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1956.

Reeves, Gareth. “T.S.Eliot and the Idea of Tradition.” Ed. Patricia Waugh. 107-118.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. 1916. eds. Charles Bally, Albert Sechehaye, and Albert Reidlinger. Trans. Wade Baskin. Great Britain: Philosophical Lib., 1960.

Selden, Raman. *The Theory of Criticism from Plato to the Present: A Reader*. London: Longman, 1988.